REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12, and 16 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Publication No. WO 01/86446 to Kessner ("Kessner") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,573 to Lim et al. ("Lim").

In view of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, and 12 to recite that the request object stores or describes information concerning "an outgoing network operation," (e.g., a network send operation). Support for this amendment can be found at page 9, line 21 bridging page 10, line 13.

Kessner discloses a load testing system for testing a website by creating **a single thread** (i.e., a Vuser thread) to handle multiple client/server requests simultaneously. (Kessner, pg. 7, lines 15-18 and 22-23.) Each Vuser thread references a "Vuser script" to generate tasks defining an exchange of data between the client computer and a server. (Kessner pg 7, lines 33-35.) The tasks being handled by the Vuser thread are stored in a data structure identifying the task. (Kessner, pg. 8, lines 1-3.) The Vuser thread then "carries out the stages of each task" (i.e., executes the network function calls defined by the task). (Kessner, pg 8, lines 1-7).

Lim is directed to an "all-purpose" client or server thread that is capable of "issuing requests on a connection and **listening for and dispatching responses received** on the connection to other client threads which issued requests on the same connection." (Lim, col. 6, lines 54-59 (emphasis added).) The Examiner particularly references Lim's description of a typical threading model as "including **a listener thread** that is assigned the responsibility of monitoring the connection for new [incoming] connection requests, if the thread is associated with the server, or [monitoring the connection for] responses to requests, if the thread is associated with the client." (Lim, col. 6, lines 23 – 33 (emphasis added).) Lim further states that "the server and the client listener threads are assigned the responsibly of dispatching either requests to an appropriate server-side 'worker' thread or an appropriated client-side caller thread, or client thread, respectively." (Lim, col. 6, lines 29 – 33.) That is, a server listener thread is responsible for dispatching incoming requests to an appropriate server-side thread, and a client listener thread is responsible for dispatching incoming requests to an appropriate client-side thread. (Lim, col. 6, lines 29 – 33.)

Thus, Lim discloses a **dedicated listener thread for receiving network communications** and forwarding those communications to the appropriate execution thread at the receiving computer. Lim is clearly limited to a handling only incoming network data with a dedicated thread. Lim does not disclose a "dedicated worker" thread for obtaining and handling **outgoing network communication requests** from multiple execution threads and sending those outgoing communications over the network to another computer.

In contrast, independent claim 1 recites a "dedicated worker thread being different from the one or more independent execution threads and configured to process the **outgoing network operation** described by the request object." Independent claims 8 and 12 recite similar features. Therefore, the combination of Kessner and Lim does not disclose all the feature of claims 1, 8, and 12, and Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 8 and 12 are patentable over the combination of Kessner and Lim.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Claims 9-11 depend from claim 11. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 12. Thus at least by virtue of the their dependency from their respective base claims 2-7, 9-11, and 13-16 are patentable over the combination of Kessner and Lim.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated July 10, 2008 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: October 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By____________________
Kevin J. Beach
Registration No.: 60,422
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys For Applicants